

1 ANN BRICK (State Bar No. 65296)  
2 MARK SCHLOSBERG (State Bar No. 209144)  
3 NICOLE A. OZER (State Bar No. 228643)  
4 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
5 FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA  
6 39 Drumm Street  
7 San Francisco, California 94111  
8 Telephone: (415) 621-2493  
9 Facsimile: (415) 255-8437  
10 abrick@aclunc.org  
11 mschlosberg@aclunc.org  
12 nozer@aclunc.org  
13

14  
15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
16 (additional counsel listed on following page)  
17  
18

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TASH HEPTING, et al.,

Case No. C-06-0672-VRW

Plaintiffs,

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD  
BE RELATED**

v.

AT&T CORP., et al.

Defendants.

TOM CAMPBELL, et al.,

Case No. 06-3596 VRW

Plaintiffs,

v.

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF  
CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED

Case No. C-06-0672-VRW

1 PETER ELIASBERG (State Bar No. 189110)  
2 CLARE PASTORE (State Bar No. 135933)  
3 ACLU FOUNDATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
4 1616 Beverly Boulevard  
5 Los Angeles, California 90026  
Telephone: (213) 977-9500  
Facsimile: (213) 250-3919  
peliasberg@aclu-sc.org  
cpastore@aclu-sc.org

6 DAVID BLAIR-LOY (State Bar No. 229235)  
7 ACLU FOUNDATION OF SAN DIEGO/IMPERIAL COUNTIES  
P.O. Box 87131  
8 San Diego, California 92138  
Telephone: (619) 232-2121  
Facsimile: (619) 232-0036  
9 dblairloy@aclusandiego.org

10 LAURENCE F. PULGRAM (State Bar No. 115163)  
11 JENNIFER L. KELLY (State Bar No. 193416)  
12 SAINA SHAMILOV (State Bar No. 215636)  
13 FENWICK & WEST LLP  
14 Embarcadero Center West  
275 Battery Street  
15 San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-2300  
Facsimile: (415) 281-1350  
lpulgram@fenwick.com  
jkelly@fenweick.com  
sshamilov@fenwick.com

16  
17 Defendant AT&T has moved that the above-captioned cases be related pursuant to Civil  
18 Local Rule 3-11.

19 The Court having considered the motion and the memorandum in opposition thereto  
20 submitted by plaintiffs in *Campbell, et al. v. AT&T Communications of California, et al.*, case no.  
21 C-06-3596 VRW and *Riordan et al. v. Verizon Communications, Inc.*, case no. C-06-3574 JSW,  
22 and good cause appearing, it is hereby ordered that defendant AT&T's motion is DENIED.

23  
24 Dated: June \_\_, 2006

---

25 United States District Judge

26  
27 [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE  
28 RELATED